

\*E-Filed 11/29/10\*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JACOB NAVARRO,

No. C 10-2890 RS (PR)

Petitioner,

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

v.

JOHN WAYNE HAVILAND,

Respondent.

**INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, seeks a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Respondent moves to dismiss the petition on grounds that the claims are unexhausted. For the reasons stated herein, respondent's motion is GRANTED, and the petition DISMISSED.

**DISCUSSION**

As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner alleges in his federal petition that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to (1) develop the issue of petitioner's intoxication at trial, (2) independently evaluate the charges against petitioner; and (3) investigate petitioner's mental condition. Petitioner also alleges that appellate counsel

No. C 10-2890 RS (PR)  
ORDER OF DISMISSAL

1 rendered ineffective assistance by failing to raise on appeal these issues regarding trial  
2 counsel's alleged trial errors. In his petition to the state supreme court, the only ineffective  
3 assistance issue petitioner presented was that trial counsel failed to request a jury instruction  
4 on a lesser included offense. (Mot. to Dismiss ("MTD"), Exs. 2 & 3 at 31.)

5 Prisoners in state custody who wish to challenge collaterally in federal habeas  
6 proceedings either the fact or length of their confinement are first required to exhaust  
7 state judicial remedies, either on direct appeal or through collateral proceedings, by  
8 presenting the highest state court available with a fair opportunity to rule on the merits  
9 of each and every claim they seek to raise in federal court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b), (c);  
10 *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 515–16 (1982). The state's highest court must be given an  
11 opportunity to rule on the claims even if review is discretionary. *See O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*,  
12 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999) (petitioner must invoke "one complete round of the State's  
13 established appellate review process."). Even though non-exhaustion is an affirmative  
14 defense, the petitioner bears the burden of proof that state judicial remedies were properly  
15 exhausted. *Parker v. Kelchner*, 429 F.3d 58, 62 (3d Cir. 2005). If available state remedies  
16 have not been exhausted as to all claims, the district court must dismiss the petition. *See*  
17 *Rose*, 455 U.S. at 510.

18 Respondent contends that the instant petition is unexhausted because petitioner never  
19 presented his claims to the California Supreme Court for decision. (MTD at 2.) Having  
20 reviewed the papers and documents submitted by the parties, this Court concludes that  
21 petitioner has not established that he fairly presented his claims to the California Supreme  
22 Court for decision. Specifically, petitioner did not present any of the claims raised in the  
23 instant petition in his petition to the state supreme court, but raised there an issue of  
24 ineffective assistance not raised here. Accordingly, respondent's motion to dismiss on  
25 grounds that the claim are not exhausted (Docket No. 6) is GRANTED. *See Rose*, 455 U.S.  
26 at 510. As the petition contains only unexhausted claims, petitioner's motion to stay the  
27 petition (Docket No. 7) is DENIED. *Id.* The petition is hereby DISMISSED. The Clerk  
28

1 shall enter judgment in favor of respondent, terminate the pending motions, and close the  
2 file. This order terminates Docket Nos. 6 & 7.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 DATED: November 24, 2010

  
5 RICHARD SEEBORG  
6 United States District Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28